

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MICHAEL A. FRIMMEL,

Case No. 3:18-cv-00144-RCJ-WGC

Plaintiff

ORDER

v.

ROMEO ARANAS et al.,

Defendants

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a former state prisoner. On January 12, 2021, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file his updated address with this Court on or before February 12, 2021. (ECF No. 41). The deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to


1 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
2 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
3 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
4 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

5 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
6 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
7 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
8 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
9 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
10 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
11 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
12 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
13 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
14 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779
15 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the
16 Court on or before February 12, 2021 expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that,
17 if Plaintiff fails to timely comply with this order, this case will be subject to dismissal without
18 prejudice." (ECF No. 41 at 2). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would
19 result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file his updated address by
20 February 12, 2021.

21 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
22 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's January 12,
23 2021, order.

24 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court will close the case and enter judgment
25 accordingly.

26 DATED THIS 17th day of February 2021.

27 
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE